

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 24-25 and 28-30 are pending in the application, with claim 24 being the independent claim. Claims 1-23, 26 and 27 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner states that claim 24 is incorrect because the pump engages a middle portion of the input shaft, not an end of the input shaft. Claim 24 has been amended to recite that the "pump engages with said input shaft." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Examiner states that claims 27 and 29 are incorrect because the piston could not be integral with the center section if it slides within the center section. Claims 26 and 27 have been cancelled, and claim 24 has been amended to provide that a hydraulic *cylinder* is combined with the control valve so that a movable portion of the hydraulic cylinder is controlled in location of the control valve, and that the center

section is a one-piece center section "forming a portion of at least one of said hydraulic cylinder and said control valve."

This amendment clarifies that the center section is one-piece and may form a portion of the hydraulic cylinder, rather than forming a portion of the hydraulic piston. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The remaining claims not specifically mentioned were rejected because they depend from one of the claims described above. Since the grounds for rejection of the claims described above have been properly accommodated and the remaining claims depend from and add features to one of the claims described above, the remaining claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to the claims described above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,713,203 to Takada *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,212,263 to Hann. Additionally, claims 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takada in view of Hann and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,133,418 to Froebe.

As noted above, claims 26 and 27 have been cancelled, and claim 24 has been amended to provide that the "center section is a one-piece center section having the closed fluid circuit and forming a portion of at least one of said hydraulic cylinder and said control valve."

Neither Takada, Hann, nor Froebe disclose this feature. The Examiner asserts that Froebe teaches a control valve (78) that is made integral with a center section (28) "by the pipe connecting the actuator to the pressure source, via 37." Office Action, page 4. However, such a configuration as taught by Froebe having a center section *with the pipe* is not a *one-piece center section "forming a portion of at least one of said hydraulic cylinder and said control valve,"* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 28-30 depend from and add features to claim 24; therefore, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Tracy-Gene G. Durkin  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,831

Date: October 3, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

449420\_1.DOC